

Good Will to Men

THOMAS A. MANNING

Brotherly Love and Patriotism

MONSIGNOR H. T. HENRY

A Pacifist Heresy

JOSEPH KEATING, S.J.

Index for the Year

The Catholic Mind

Volume XXXIV, No. 24 December 22, 1936 Price 5 Cents

THE AMERICA PRESS - 461 Eighth Avenue - New York, N. Y.

APRIL

MAY

JUNE

For Christmas

"COME, LET US ADORE"

By FRANCIS P. LeBUFFE, S.J.

CHRISTMAS THOUGHTS

By WILLIAM I. LONERGAN, S.J.

THE CHRIST CHILD

By JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J.

10 (by mail 12) cents each

\$7.00 per 100 :: \$60.00 per 1,000 (assorted)

AT BETHLEHEM'S CRIB

THE WORD MADE FLESH

By TIMOTHY BROSNAHAN, S.J.

MARY IMMACULATE

By WILLIAM I. LONERGAN, S.J.

Complete set (postpaid) 45c

5 (by mail 7) cents each

\$4.00 per 100 :: \$30.00 per 1,000 (assorted)

Postage extra on bulk orders

THE AMERICA PRESS

461 Eighth Avenue

New York, N. Y.

THE CATHOLIC MIND, December 22, 1936. Volume XXXIV, No. 24. Published semi-monthly by The America Press, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York. Subscription postpaid, United States, 5 cents a copy; yearly, \$1.00; foreign, \$1.25. Entered as second-class matter, October 22, 1914, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 4, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rates of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1913. Trade-mark "Catholic Mind," Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

Good Will to Men

THOMAS A. MANNING

A GORGEOUS shaft of silvery light streams from a blazing star in the jewel studded canopy of midnight. King and Commoner stand amazed as its glistening beams spray woodland and field. Crude astronomical charts are scanned to register its identity, and learn its meaning. Simple, unlettered folk see in it the fulfilment of a prophecy. Lonely shepherds on the hills catch a glimpse of a heavenly vision. Angelic voices on high chant the sweet refrain of "Glory to God in the Highest and Peace on Earth to Men of Good Will." Three humble figures, alone from all the millions of the Orient journey across a continent to pay homage to an Infant King. Into a cold, hard, calloused world where injustice was carving deep and ugly wounds and wrong singing its pæans of triumph over right had come a new and different personality *destined* to shock and challenge a pagan civilization. Men labored and died hoping always that before eyes grew dim they would be privileged to behold a visible sign of the promise eagerly awaited throughout the centuries. And now it suddenly appears and its deathless message thunders through pagan temple, forum and mart. Oracle and soothsayer alike are numbed. Pharisee and scribe mumble weird prayers. A sycophant king fearing loss of imperial glory commands the slaughter of innocent babes. It is a wicked Cæsar's answer to the new spiritual force whose influence has reshaped civilizations mould.

What a contrast that Christmas night in the City of Bethlehem presented. A poor, tired and footworn carpenter and his family are quartered in a crudely built stable behind an inn. In a manger filled with straw lay a new born Babe wrapped in swaddling clothes. Gathered about the joyous family were humble shepherds who instinctively realized that they were kneeling in the presence of something divine. In the streets of the city were Herod's soldiers equipped with bristling saber and lance guarding far flung empire frontiers. In the palace the glittering pomp and boasted luxury of a pagan monarch told the story of embruting rule. In the

temples money changers filched for gold. Serfs' were flogged into menial tasks. The unrelenting code of Roman might was supreme on land and sea. Yet it was here in this stable in a far off kingdom amidst the tyranny of a system which crushed and bruised that mankind received the first message of peace. Here a new philosophy of life entirely at variance with ancient creeds gave a new promise. Here greed and hate were branded as lepers of humanity. Here the Brotherhood of Man was joined with the Fatherhood of God.

Hate's sharp steel and war's mighty bludgeon have left on history's pages sordid imprints. But two decades ago the war god trumpeted his deafening blast along new offensive fronts. Destruction belched from behind miles of entrenchments while fury drove its frothing steeds and flaming chariots through princely cities and verdant meadows. Then weary, exhausted and bleeding at every pore, friend and foe cried frantically for peace. Civilization stood with jagged wounds ripped and clawed in her fair breast and in her hands held the broken staff of high ideals. Ages of art, culture and enlightenment were almost erased by one fell swoop of war's crimsoned scimiter. Then did humanity shriek for a treaty that would insure against recurrence of such a holocaust. Palsied gestures for peace were made while diplomatic knaves weaved threads of hate through its tapestry. Age long grievances did not terminate with the bold stroke of ornated quills. Racial prides and aggrandizements became the keystones in the arch of the new covenants cast amidst the intrigue and chicanery of an old world's philosophy.

And so we wonder as we behold modern dreadnaughts cruising over wide and trackless seas, steel winged hawks mounting cloud waves and science prescribing new formulas of decimation, has two thousand years upon this war scarred planet been lived in vain? Do the measured treads of marching battalions defy the Prince of Peace as did the panoplied legions from the banks of the Tiber? Will countless new lives again be sacrificed and numberless graves be made? Will the world once more stand in the reeking presence of cyclonic disaster?

Through eleven months of the year fraught with grief and woe we experience life's exacting law of compensations.

We grow weary of routine tasks and bitterly complain that discriminations are invoked against us, yet always eagerly strive to gain vantage mounts by fraud, slander or artifice. The barbs of jealousy prick deep and irritations quickly fester. The incessant struggle for enrichment seems to blunt our finer sensibilities. Captivated by allurements of power we claw for titles and privileges. Primitive instincts are still compelling. Then the Christmas season begins to cast its spell. The century after century told story of a Babe in a Crib filters through to soften a world hardened by strife and greeds. All thoughts of bitterness vanish. The milk of human kindness fills our cup to overflowing. The Christmas carols recall the fond memories of yester-years. We are at peace with God and Man. The world is one great cathedral.

And so from that star we gain an inspiration for a new resolve. We absorb the sustaining warmth of its influence and acquire new strength for our common tasks. Fear and discouragement may again attack. Ambition may be chilled and disappointments stalk behind each effort, but we love to think of the power for good it can wield. It is because of this perhaps we see reflected a little brighter, those sterling qualities in men which draw us closer to them, and then we say why can't other days be like Christmas day? Some day perhaps the world may see through the blinding mists of prejudice, bigotry and hate. Some day will those enshrouding veils be lifted. Then will jungle codes and the rule of iron mace be banished from civilization's realm.

So on Christmas Day we dwell again upon the glory of Bethlehem's star. Each Christmas has the world seen its silvery shafts since first the Magi from the East blazed the trail to a manger. Like them civilization too has traveled over winding dusty roads, blistering desert wastes, and forded angry streams. And so it will continue until the perilous slopes are scaled and the yawning chasms bridged. Time has stretched its hoary fingers from stone caves to bungalows, but culture only appears to veneer those primitive urges. To gain the full value of the Christmas text we view it not alone as the deathless story of a babe and shepherds, but as the dynamic force of an eternal truth which must form an integral part of the life of a world now groping its way through dark and fearful nights.

Brotherly Love and Patriotism

RIGHT REV. MSGR. H. T. HENRY, LITT.D.

*Reprinted from the Homiletic and Pastoral Review
in the issue of August, 1936.*

WHEN explaining the parable of the Good Samaritan, Bishop Bonomelli remarks in a footnote: "It is well known that the Jews taught that only Jews were their neighbors; as to other peoples, as to foreigners, they had no determinate ideas about them; as a rule, they regarded all foreigners as enemies, and it seems they thought it lawful to hate them: 'Thou shalt hate thine enemy.'" Today, in times of war, patriotism unfortunately seems to find this ancient point of view profitable to instill, with diabolical adroitness, into the minds and hearts of a people towards the "enemy."

"Who is my neighbor?" The parable clearly insinuates that all mankind is our neighbor. The word *insinuates* may appear to be what has been called a "weasel" word. But its insinuation is marvelous in this, that it does not directly teach that all men are my neighbors, but only that, as the Jewish lawyer replied to Our Saviour, anyone—even such a hated foreigner as every Samaritan was to a Jew—who is kind to me, albeit a hated foreigner, is my neighbor in good truth. Meanwhile the neighborly love of a Christian must extend to all mankind, whether we have received good or evil treatment from its peoples or races, its customs or ideals, its pretensions or its performances.

It occurs to me that Christ's doctrine expounded in the Sermon on the Mount could be made more intelligible to the people if the words *hate* and *love* were understood differently from (as I surmise) the ordinary way of interpreting them. The word *love* could, I think, often be better (or, at least, more intelligibly) employed, if *loving* were sometimes rendered as *liking*. We are hardly masters of our likes and dislikes, which may be instinctive and solely emotional. But *love*, in its ascetical meaning, is less an emotion than an act of the will. We can *love* what we *dislike*.

In time of war, or of the popular excitement that may end in war, or of the making of a treaty after a war, we could do a truly patriotic thing. We could preach on the parable of the Good Samaritan, and thus try to temper popular dislikes with the Gospel doctrine of love. We could thus confer on the attractive topic of patriotism a Christian enlargement of purview that would exalt a natural virtue into a supernatural one, a human instinct of self-preservation into a divine duty of forgiveness and true love as taught in the Gospel of Christ. The world is more and more tending towards the thought attributed to Benjamin Franklin, that there never was a good war or a bad peace. The war to end war was followed almost immediately by some score-and-a-half of wars. The end now is to seek peace at almost any price. Why? Alas, for a predominantly natural motive which, however, could be supernaturalized with doubtless greater ultimate effectiveness.

Patriotism is a difficult topic to handle, because it is a sentiment rooted somehow most deeply in our nature. It accordingly can beget an emotion which can easily smother logical analysis. Philosophers like Cicero become almost lyrical in their description of its duties and its real nature. Patriotism is emotional: "Let me make the songs of a people, and I care not who makes its laws." Yes—and a citizen who seems hardly to know who are his rulers and what kinds of laws they make, will contentedly "go along" with his party affiliations, unless grinding poverty and the desperation arising from it may finally issue in bloody revolution, which in its turn is sustained by wildly emotional songs.

As for the definitions of patriotism, we come upon some curious ones. Cicero regarded his fatherland as *communis omnium parens*, and extolled the commonwealth as conterminous with the fatherland: "Our parents, children, relations, and neighbors are dear, but our fatherland (*patria*) embraces the whole round of these endearments; in defense of it, who would not dare to die if only he could assist it?" Elsewhere, however, Cicero quotes a curious definition of the fatherland: *Patria est, ubicumque est bene*. Herein we find the justification of the immigrant who has left his fatherland with the hopeful outlook of greater happiness in a strange land, a land which he will make his adopted fatherland. He can justly call this new land *his* country, and can

sing with relish some of the lines (especially the first three) of "My Country, 'tis of thee." Doubtless the most curious of all the definitions of patriotism is the one that intimates the scorn which Samuel Johnson felt for the professional patriot: "Patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel." Our own similarly disillusioned day asks: "Who put the Pay in Patriotism?"

Meanwhile, the definition of patriotism as love for one's country will not discriminate between Daughters (or Sons) of the American Revolution and mere natives (or, as the pleonasm has it, "native-born" citizens); or between these two classes and the merely "naturalized" citizens. The *patria* has become grandly inclusive or comprehensive, and is indeed *communis omnium parens*. We ought to understand and to perform zealously the duties that patriotism lays upon our energies, to whatsoever class of citizens we may belong. Cicero outlined the duties in eloquent fashion from the standpoint of what we may call "the natural virtues." It is the business of a Catholic citizen to understand what patriotism is and to supernaturalize our performance of the duties it places on us. No matter what land is our fatherland, we are nevertheless on earth as pilgrims and strangers, having here no lasting tabernacle but looking for one that is to come, eternal in Heaven.

TWO FATHERLANDS

We have, then, two fatherlands—a limited portion of earth, an unlimited portion of heaven. Citizenship in the former ought to prepare us for citizenship in the latter. Indeed, as St. Paul noted, whilst we still are on earth our "conversation," our citizenship, is really in heaven, or ought to be there.

Apropos, I should like to quote the whole of Chapter XV (*Christianus Civis*—Christian Citizenship) of the volume by Dom Anscar Vonier, entitled "Christianus." He begins by remarking: "More heartburnings have been caused to Christians by the problems of citizenship than by any other human issue." He proceeds to describe and analyze our two kinds of citizenship that are answerable for the Christian's heartburnings due to the variously issuing problems. But let me here excerpt merely a portion of one paragraph (pp. 175, 176):

With the prodigious developments of national sentiment which are such an outstanding psychological phenomenon of our times, it may sound hard to the ears even of fervent Catholics that the great King, Christ, is at war with the nations of the earth, that He is unceasingly intent on breaking their pride, that there is not one nation which as a common polity is not an obstacle to the sovereignty of the Lamb. Still, a little candor ought to make us face the facts as they are. The civilization which we know of and in which we live and have our being is profoundly inimical to Christ. No nation today would move a finger, would spend a farthing, for Christ's cause, if it were asked to do so. So we may take it as an axiom that our Christian citizenship must clash with the merely natural citizenship whereby we are citizens of states more or less prosperous. The phases of that conflict need not be gone into here. From the martyrdom of a Blessed Thomas More to the disinherited daughter of a wealthy family who is turned out because she has done the un-English thing of becoming a Catholic there are many variations of that same difficulty.

Hereupon he quotes Our Saviour: "Do not think that I came to send peace upon earth: I came not to send peace, but the sword . . ." (Matt. x. 34-36). And he comments upon Our Lord's words as follows: "One universal principle we may state here. No Christian worthy of the name can throw himself into national citizenship head over heels, as if such loyalty were an ultimate reality, a kind of divine Absolute. Earthly citizenship must always be secondary with him, relative, provisional, as the Christian is truly the citizen of a much higher policy." Our parish school problem is a case in point. To deny all religious elements in the youthful training of the future citizenship of the American people, as is the unfortunate fact in the public schools, is in effect to train (in so far as the training itself goes) children up to atheism. The problem is not truly a negative one. It is truly a positive one. We are in effect heavily taxed in our effort to train children in religion as well as in secular matters, whilst we are also taxed to help the public schools in a practically atheistic training of children. As between Christ and Cæsar, the choice is officially for Cæsar. This fact is clearly perceived by many thoughtful Protestants of eminence in the body politic. Meanwhile, the nation is proudly claimed (even by some Catholics) as a Christian nation, just as some Protestants have (ludicrously, as witnessed by the statistics of those who are not even church-goers) claimed that we are a Protestant people. "They have eyes and see not." Meanwhile, Catholics are patriotic in

times of peace and of war alike. Peace finds its victories in our innumerable institutions of education and of charity. War finds its victories in holocausts of Catholic soldiers. Let preachers instruct the people in the ways of supernaturalizing such deeds of love and deeds of valor. Dom Anscar's chapter will clear the air for preacher and people.

PATRIOTISM NOT PECULIAR TO CHRISTIANITY

Patriotism is not peculiar to Christianity. Thoughtful philosophers like Cicero esteemed it highly. Even savages of the Dark Continent gladly give their lives in tribute to it. Is it, then, a virtue or merely such in instinct as a dog has for defending, with its life, his master or the house it lives in—but quite ready as well to do the same office for another master who buys it and installs it in another house?

Theologians appear to find some difficulty in locating patriotism among the supernatural virtues. Benedict XIV, for instance, points out that the four cardinal virtues can have several parts annexed, some of which are *potential*, others *subjective*, others *integral*. Employing thus the terminology of the Schools, he annexes four subjective parts to *prudence*. They are: "Monastic, which is concerned with the good of the individual; economic, with the good of the house or family; political, with the good of the city, commonwealth, or kingdom; and military, which directs in warfare a multitude assembled for a time to defend a country from enemies and to repel their attacks." All of these, it would seem, could be placed in the category of patriotism for one reason or another. Patriotism, therefore, belongs to the family of prudence.

On the other hand, Father Waldron, in "The Catholic Encyclopedia," annexes patriotism to the cardinal virtue of *justice*, because justice has annexed to it the virtue of piety, "which disposes to the fulfillment of duties which one owes to parents and to country (Patriotism)." My readers may consult the "Encyclopedia" (XV, 473c). However, Father Tanquerey does not even use the word patriotism in his sufficiently large volume, "The Spiritual Life," in which he discusses the virtues at length. This fact may appear a striking one in view of the eloquent and emotional ways in which the French people refer to *La Patrie*. And Father

Tanquerey is not singular in this omission of the word patriotism from his volume.

In brief, patriotism seems to be somewhat elusive in respect of analysis and description. Father Waldron puts the word in marks of parenthesis. Benedict XIV does not mention it. Neither does Father Tanquerey, or Father Devine in his "Manual of Ascetical Theology," so far as I have observed. But Father Skelly, in his volume of "Sermons and Addresses" (Herder, 1929), remarks that "our great Catholic theologians place it as the second of the moral virtues in honor and worth" (p. 52). I am wondering, therefore, whether patriotism might be properly viewed as basically an emotional urge to put certain rather numerous virtues in operation. Pagans, Christians, savages, seem to possess such an emotional urge and under its influence are led to exhibit many splendid natural virtues. The Christian supernaturalizes this emotion, just as he can supernaturalize the various instincts of love, hate, pride, and so on.

I admit having been surprised at the tremendous value ascribed to patriotism in a certain Catholic periodical. The writer ended a long account of the grand work performed by Sisters of Charity for wounded soldiers in times of war, and wrote: "The incidents we have related . . . deserve to be repeated at this time if only to remind our separated brethren that Catholic doctrine teaches us that love of country is second only to love of God." Not only does the article end with this newly-phrased statement of what Our Saviour called the second commandment of the Law, but the heading given to the article in large and bold type is similarly arresting: "Love of Country is Second Only to Love of God, and this Point in Catholic Doctrine is Forcibly Brought Out in a Study of the Glorious Work of the Sisters of Charity in War." One is hereupon led to inquire whether patriotism is notable for inculcating love of one's wartime enemies. But that is just what the parable of the Good Samaritan teaches us—to love our enemies as ourselves.

The quoted declaration of Catholic doctrine is arresting for various reasons. First of all, it is undeniably certain that the Sisters of Charity would have gone with equal alacrity and equally Godlike kindness to succor a wounded soldier of the enemy forces. It is not simply through love of country that a Sister of Charity—or any other Sister—

attends the sick or dying soldier, but through love of God, "with charity to all" (to employ Lincoln's words). For the Sister of Charity understands the meaning of the parable of the Good Samaritan, and does not pause to ask, with the Jewish doctor of the law: "And who is my neighbor?" Meanwhile, I have no doubt that the Sister feels the emotion of patriotism as strongly as any one of us understands or feels it. No doubt she also has brothers and cousins who have been killed by the enemy. She loves her country as dearly as any fighting soldier, and mayhap more dearly than most of the highly placed diplomats and statesmen whose gross bungling of their dignified job may have led otherwise friendly nations into the scientifically wholesale slaughter which is modern war.

Again, the writer of the article declares that love of country is second only to love of God, and thus reminds us once more of the Good Samaritan parable which tells us that it is the love of the neighbor that is second only to the love of God. But patriotism (as it is understood and practiced today) and love of neighbor can hardly be considered as equivalent terms, if by "neighbor" we understand what the parable clearly indicates, namely, the love of all mankind without distinction of nationality, race, color or creed, friendly or hostile intent, helpful or hindering customs, ideals, economic or financial relationships, commercial or trading policies.

We must supernaturalize our virtue of patriotism according to the Gospel standard. God forgive us if we *hated* our foes in the World War through a false interpretation of patriotism! God enlighten us now to understand better and to carry out more fully the teaching of the parable we have been considering in this paper! We can do this—because God does not ask us to *like* our enemies, but only to *love* them.

A Pacifist Heresy

JOSEPH KEATING, S.J.

*Reprinted from the Month (London), in the
issue of October, 1936.*

IT seems paradoxical to say, in a Europe more than ever "bristling with bayonets," and overclouded with the menace of war, that the chief moral principle which seems in danger of being obscured is the right of self-defense, inherent both in the individual and in the community. But so it seems to be. The very belligerency taught by dictators and too readily assimilated in the still-democratic countries, has aroused a corresponding reaction, and over against the "Prussian" doctrine that Aggression is always lawful, we find the other extreme that Resistance to Aggression is never right. Extreme pacifism has been growing and spreading since the Great War, and the prospect of another and a greater has only stimulated its increase. The movement embraces both genuine and false adherents: those who really believe that physical violence is never lawful, and those who wish to confine it to a struggle not between nations but between classes. Added to these are the Catholics who hold in the abstract the right of self-defense but think that the exercise of that right of the community *de facto* causes such untold moral and material evil, not only to the belligerent Powers but to the world at large, that in practice justice must yield to charity and injustice must be met by patient endurance. The doctrine that there is no merely temporal good the preservation of which would justify a community in exposing the world to the evils of modern warfare, which *ex hypothesi* can now never be confined to the original disputants, is beginning to make its appearance in Catholic moral teaching, although no authorized moral treatise has yet withdrawn as irrelevant the stock enumeration of causes which justify warfare. Nowhere has the Catholic case against war been more strongly and clearly urged than in Father Stratmann's study of "The Church and War," first published in 1929, and now in a second edition. Considering

all its modern developments Father Stratmann asserts that for the first time in history it has become doubtful whether any cause, however righteous and important, can justify the recourse to war. Furthermore, another distinguished Catholic philosopher, the well-known ex-leader of the pre-Mussolini Catholic "Partito Popolare" in Italy, Dom Luigi Sturzo, has recently criticized from the pacifist standpoint, the action of those Catholics in Spain who, in order to prevent the suppression of religion by the Spanish Reds, have actively supported the military efforts to overthrow the Communist Government. He says that the early Christians did not oppose the pagan persecutors by material force, and that, in our own time, the Catholics of France submitted to the anti-clerical laws aimed at the extirpation of Catholicism. Yet the Faith triumphed over both the violent Roman persecutions and the "legal" French variety; the inference being that to take up arms and provoke civil war, even in defense of religion, is at any rate not so Christian as turning the other cheek to the smiter. I merely wish to quote Dom Luigi here, so as to illustrate how deeply the horror of unlimited warfare has impressed the Catholic mentality: his conception of the moral character of Catholic participation in the Spanish Revolution is another matter.

Outside the Church pacifism has run riot. For nearly three centuries the Society of Friends has professed non-resistance to evil as a fundamental principle. A prominent Anglican, Canon Shepherd, claims that he has secured the support of upwards of 100,000 men in a determination never in future to bear arms on any account whatever. Mr. George Lansbury, one of the chiefs of the Labor party, recently retired from its leadership because he could not countenance its policy of national defense. Many of the intelligentsia who have the ear of the public—Mr. Aldous Huxley,¹ Mr. A. A. Milne,² Mr. Beverley Nichols,³ to mention only a few—use their literary ability to expose, not only the imbecility but also the immorality of armed conflict, and to preach the doctrine of non-resistance. Thus both Christians and non-Christians unite to regard the practice of seeking to settle disputes by armed violence as something which reason as

¹ "The Case for Constructive Peace" (Chatto & Windus).

² "Peace with Honour," 5th edition (Methuen).

³ "Cry Havoc."

well as revelation condemns as intrinsically evil, not wrong because of the use of wrong means, but because *all* violent means are wrong; not wrong because of evil concomitants and results, but wrong *in se*, independent of circumstances; not wrong because today all restrictions as to weapons and objectives have gone, but wrong in all ages.

Added to the Christians and the non-Christians are the anti-Christian Communists who are vociferous supporters of out-and-out pacifism, but only for their own subversive ends. These latter are openly proclaimed—the ultimate overthrow of the propertied class and of religion which is its supposed bulwark, and the abolition of national armed forces likely to be used in suppressing their efforts. With these false pacifists we have here no concern, save to mark the general discredit and confusion in which their adherence involves the general desire to get rid of war. Yet it may be that more harm is done by genuine advocates of peace, whose advocacy reposes on emotion instead of on reason, or on a sincere though mistaken interpretation of Christian teaching, than by the clumsy exploitation of the anti-war sentiment by the Third International.

But whilst pointing out what is heretical in much of the modern peace movement, let us bear in mind the vast and growing evil against which it is the natural instinctive reaction—the war-mongering of the militarists. By militarists I mean not only those secularists who still believe that the world should continue to evolve under the spur of the struggle for existence, but all who, blinded by racial pride or merely too lazy to think, imagine that security can be found today in armed predominance. Their voices are strident in the press.

No one nation ever confesses to aggressive designs. Each recent proclaiming of a further increase of fighting-strength—Russia's calling up youths of nineteen, Germany's doubling the term of conscript service, France's re-fortifying her "impregnable" frontier, Italy's threat of mobilizing eight millions in a few hours—is accompanied by the expression of a fervent desire to help to ensure the peace of Europe. Only Signor Mussolini is not so positive. He desires, to be sure, to live at peace with the rest, but only "as long as possible": perpetual peace is "an absurd idea contrary to our Fascist doctrine," which, as declared in the "Fascist Encyclopædia," is

that "war alone brings all human energies to their highest tension and stamps the mark of nobility on those peoples who have the courage to face it." And one main reason for the present gleam of industrial prosperity in this and other lands is the sinister and deplorable fact that iron and steel and coal and chemicals are being fashioned by labor into instruments of death—useless so long as there is peace, and only useful in war to destroy.

Let us here contemplate the imbecility of all these modern war-preparations, imbecility in which every nation shares which is not straining every nerve to propagate peace, especially by removing obvious causes of war. This colossal expenditure on "defense," amounting now to £2,000,000,000 annually, though meant by each State to increase security, leaves each relatively as insecure as before, and, moreover, is largely wasted, because devoted to obsolete weapons. There is no statesman who does not know that the next war will not be decided on the field of battle but in large civilian centers. Those who want to be comparatively safe will flock to the camps and the fleets! The only Front that matters will be the Home Front and that will face upwards towards the skies. Yet they continue to raise "defensive" armies and fleets, whereas the only defense possible would be to roof their chief cities with impenetrable glass or to return to the life of the troglodytes. For truly in this new form of warfare, there is no real defense but prior attack or later reprisal.

Now, when we consider that aerial warfare cannot discriminate between man and woman, child and adult, hospital and factory, in its diffusion of fire and poison and immeasurable destruction, can we wonder that the man in the street feels ready to revolt against any government which has not managed somehow or other to avert this awful visitation? He sees as yet no signs of such effort. The effects of the last war are still crushing and paralyzing large sections of the world, yet all around us are frenzied preparations for a new and greater struggle, the result of which may well be the end of civilization, and in any case *cannot* finally or permanently benefit any nation. Common sense would suggest that statesmen should start with the absolute principle—No More War, and then come together and shape their policies accordingly. They all have ratified the Paris Pact renouncing war. They see its advantage in theory but, because

putting it into practice would involve some national sacrifice, they have all lapsed again into the old ruts, and their minds are filled with the old ideas of national prestige, the supremacy of force, the struggle for existence, the desire for monopoly—all the passions which came to such a woeful head in 1914, and are again ominously at work.

One of the fundamental rights of human beings is the right of self-preservation. It may be forfeited by crime, it may be voluntarily abandoned for good reasons, but, until forfeited or abandoned, justice demands that it be respected. It is the teaching of reason that every nature is endowed by the Creator with what tends to its persistence: it must seek its proper good, and the chief good is existence itself. Thus murder and suicide—the unlawful taking of human life—are acts so radically evil that no motive or circumstances can justify them. This dictate of reason is enforced and made explicit by God's revealed commandment: the prohibition of killing is the negative aspect of the duty of keeping alive. Now the extreme pacifist who maintains that non-resistance to an intending murderer is a moral duty, and that this is the way in which we must subdue evil by good, finds no support in reason for his view. So he falls back on revelation and says that this is the Gospel teaching of Christ; multiplying texts to prove it. The Catholic Church, the authorized interpreter of the Gospel, denies the pacifist exposition of those texts: her theologians consistently maintain that *vim vi repellere*—to resist force by force, even to the extent of killing the assailant who attempts your life—is the natural right of every human being. The right is voluntarily given up by the martyr who allows the persecutor to slay him for the Faith, but it is so real a right that no blame would attach to a man who should prefer to kill the enemy of the Faith who sought his life rather than submit to being killed by him in that high cause. He would miss the glory of martyrdom by so doing, but he would not have sinned. Non-resistance to evil is not a command but a counsel, it does not refer to the community but only to the individual. It is thus that the Church reconciles the authentic teaching of her Spouse and Master with the revelation of God in nature—the Natural Law. Our Lord does not call everyone to the same practice of perfection: to the Rich Young Man He recommended voluntary renunciation of goods; to others

to abstain from marriage. He suggests to some a closer following which involves a wide abandonment of many natural rights whilst leaving all free to confine themselves to the observance of the Commandments. Oblivion of this clear and necessary distinction, so familiar to the Catholic, has involved much non-Catholic pacifist thought in much confusion.

A confusion which grows immeasurably greater when the counsels of perfection are considered applicable to the community, for this ignores another radical distinction. The moral law, expressed in the commandments, binds both individual and group equally: the counsels of perfection, on the other hand, have no reference to societies organized for merely temporal objects. A private person may fairly and properly be asked to forgo natural rights in view of the reward to come. He thus "loses" his life here, to "gain" it more abundantly hereafter. But organized society has no hereafter. It must achieve its well-being on earth, or miss it altogether. There are no States (thank God!) in Heaven—only an assortment of God's children, saved through the grace of His redemption, and most humbly grateful for their election. Consequently—confining attention to the organization of the State—governments have no right to sacrifice the nation's possessions unless for some equivalent or greater temporal good. They are the trustees of manifold interests entrusted to them by the nation, and cannot infringe their trust unless the nation consents. Their express *raison d'être* is the temporal welfare of the community, and they hold their powers only to secure this aim. If, therefore, they were not to defend real and important national interests—not to say, the existence and autonomy of the nation itself—they would be committing grave dereliction of duty.

Accordingly, it is not for the State to turn the other cheek to the aggressor, nor to hand over its cloak to the thief who has taken its tunic. Yet there are reputable men who would impose on the State as a duty what God's law leaves to the free choice of the individual—the practice of non-resistance. It is this vein of unreason which, I repeat, vitiates the zealous peace-advocacy of the extreme pacifist. Nothing can win permanent acceptance that is manifestly absurd, or would result, if applied, in further absurdities, or has never been successful in past experience. In this fallen world,

force must be behind law, if law is to be effective. This is obvious in every well-ordered State; it is still more obvious when we consider the much looser community of nations, many of which have in practice rejected Christianity even as an ethical ideal. Accordingly, failing a genuine determination on the part of every nation to give up the practice of settling disputes or defending rights by armed force, all nations must continue to maintain defensive forces. And, as has often been pointed out, the only sensible way to avoid the consequent prevalence of threat and defiance and competitive arming, is to formulate the law of international dealings, and then put the forces of the world behind the law, instead of behind the litigant, by some form of collectivism.

Happily the believing Catholic has in his Faith security against the heresies of Pacifism. Knowing that God has enjoined warfare in the past and that His Church has consistently taught that war under certain conditions is righteous, he can never commit the error of thinking that the practice is intrinsically wicked. If it were, then God would have approved of evil in the past, and the Church would have grievously failed in her function of teaching true morality. But, standing firmly on the principle that national self-defense is a right and a duty, he is the more free to denounce all policies that savor of aggression, or show disregard of the just rights of other nations. If he cannot be a complete pacifist, still less can he be a militarist: he should, in fact, always be a peacemaker, and oppose the hatred and greed that masquerade as patriotism but are merely mass-envy and pride. And he should especially insist upon the fact that the normal teaching of the Church regarding the lawfulness, on occasion, of armed violence in defense or assertion of right, was framed when fighting was confined to professional armies equipped with few and relatively ineffective weapons. The Church has never formally pronounced upon that aspect of modern warfare, which includes the slaughter, on a large scale and of set purpose, of multitudes who are technically innocent of offense. The militarist cannot plead that nowadays the whole nation is mobilized for war and that there are, therefore, no non-combatants. There are, in hundreds of thousands—women, children, the sick, the aged, the incapable and those consecrated to the service of God. Catholics should never rest in this peace-crusade to abolish the

abominable excesses of warfare—indiscriminate bombing, the use of poison gas and of disease-germs, attacks on the Red Cross, the wanton destruction of churches, and so forth. The nations themselves have tried half-heartedly to check the growing barbarity of war: they would welcome, one might hope, the explicit, condemnation by the Church, as unlawful and immoral, of many modern means of warfare, for thus the hands of the peacemakers would be strengthened.

And apart from the mere consideration of humanity and culture, the Catholic has an additional motive, perhaps the strongest of all, for laboring to remove the causes of war, and to humanize its practice. War is the main obstacle to the most important of human enterprises, the evangelization of the world, and by setting Catholics of different nations at variance it hinders the realization of membership of the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the salt of civilization. The outbreak of war paralyzes for a time the whole missionary activity of the Church and injures permanently the work of conversion. Generations must elapse before the missions can recover from the wounds caused by the last war. But the point need not be labored: it is universally admitted that warfare is both the cause and the occasion of innumerable moral evils: also that modern warfare, in so far as it recognizes no non-combatants, seems to differ *in kind* from the old sort.

How gladly, then, should we welcome a condemnation by the Church of certain modern methods of warfare—especially aerial bombing and the use of poison gas—on the ground that they necessarily involve the killing of the innocent, and cannot, of their own nature, be used in the only legitimate form of warfare, that of national defense. Such condemnation would leave intact the great moral principle, thus expressed in Canon Law: *Vim vi repellere omnes canones et omnia jura permittunt.*

The Catholic Mind

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXIV.

January 8 to December 22, 1936

1. Birth Prevention. Cardinal Hayes. p. 1.
Birth Rate Data. Cardinal Hayes. p. 6.
Facing Present Realities. Monsignor R. F. Keegan. p. 10.
2. The Bible in English. J. Corbett. p. 21.
Moral and Economic Problems. R. A. Sauer. p. 28.
Euthanasia. p. 34.
Why Blame the Boy? J. T. Ryan. p. 36.
3. The Catholic Priesthood. Pope Pius XI. p. 41.
Socialist Education. p. 80.
Appeal to End Persecution. p. 84.
4. The Pope Amid Storms. A. O'Hare McCormick. p. 85.
The Papacy and the League of Nations. P. G. Steinbicker, p. 95.
Separation of Church and State. W. Parsons. p. 100.
5. Constitutional Liberty and Our Immoral Economic Order. I. W. Cox. p. 105.
The American Liberty League and Our Immoral Economic Order. I. W. Cox. p. 113.
Church Unity. p. 122.
6. The Vatican Concordat With the German Reich. J. F. Thorning. p. 125.
The Pope and the War. p. 133.
Why Not Meet Each Other Half Way? O'Brien Atkinson. p. 140.
7. What Is a Catholic Press? M. de la Bedoyère. p. 145.
A Letter from Cardinal Newman. p. 153.
A List of Catholic Authors. F. Talbot. p. 155.
8. St. Thomas Aquinas. W. Coleman Nevils. p. 165.
Father Damien. P. M. Dunne. p. 173.
Labels That Mislead. D. Woodruff. p. 178.
Modern Progress and the Ages of Faith. Most Rev. J. Duhig. p. 182.
9. Ideas and Ideals in Education. A. J. Hogan. p. 185.
Wages and Our Immoral Economic Order. I. G. Cox. p. 190.
Murder Dressed as Mercy. M. J. Scott. p. 197.
10. The Morality of Sterilization. E. J. Mahoney. p. 205.
A Living Wage and Our Immoral Economic Order. I. W. Cox. p. 217.
11. America's Challenge to Catholic Education. T. J. Higgins. p. 225.
Catholic Girl Scouts. C. J. McGovern. p. 238.
The Catholic Evidence Guild. p. 242.

12. Social Reconstruction. J. A. Smith. p. 245.
St. Augustine's Social Program. W. A. Carey. p. 253.
The Economy of High Wages. J. Clayton. p. 259.
Nuns as Public School Teachers. p. 262.
13. Democracy at the Crossroads. Monsignor R. F. Keegan. p. 265.
Catholic Principles and War. B. Gavan Duffy. p. 281.
14. Communists Perverting Youth. H. S. McDevitt. p. 285.
Pope Warns of Perils in Godless Communism. p. 297.
Class War! J. V. Benson. p. 301.
15. On Clean Motion Pictures. Pope Pius XI. p. 305.
In Praise of the Encyclical. Most Rev. J. T. McNicholas, O.P. p. 318.
Pope Pius Speaks on the Movies. F. Talbot. p. 321.
Pope Lauds Work of Legion. p. 323.
16. Mexican Bishops' Pastoral on Church's Efforts to Improve Conditions of Workingmen. p. 325.
Mexico, Cardenas, and the Church. J. Castiello. p. 338.
The Calles Aftermath. R. Pond. p. 341.
China's Harvest. p. 344.
17. The Catholic Church and American Culture. M. J. Ahern. p. 345.
"Catholic" or "Roman Catholic"? E. P. Reynolds. p. 358.
The Behavior-Problem Child. D. L. Leary. p. 363.
18. Problems of Youth. Most B. J. Sheil. p. 365.
Youth and Racial Attitude. F. S. Moseley. p. 369.
Is Parole Wrong? L. Lucey. p. 372.
Is It Parole? R. L. Huff. p. 379.
Salient Dates in Catholic Education in U. S. p. 384.
19. Discourse of Pope Pius XI to the Spanish Refugees. p. 385.
The Spanish Warning. G. M. Godden. p. 395.
Scenes, of Blood, Fire and Ruin. p. 400.
Red Valdalism. p. 404.
20. Communism in American Education. H. S. McDevitt. p. 405.
The Holy Name Society's Catholic Action. Most Rev. A. G. Cicognani. p. 418.
God or Chaos. A. E. Smith. p. 423.
21. The Christian Constitution of States. Pope Leo XIII. p. 425.
Questions on the Encyclical "Immortale Dei." p. 449.
References. p. 450.
22. German Bishops' Pastoral Asking Removal of Restrictions on Church. p. 455.
The God-need Today. F. Talbot. p. 460.
Mercy-Murder. A. Guthrie Badenoch. p. 464.
Christ the Worker's Brother. A. O'Rahilly. p. 470.
23. Marital Maladjustment and Social Disorder. G. Vann. p. 475.
No Masses in Madrid. W. Parsons. p. 483.
Wanted: A Catholic Revolution. Sister Cecilia. p. 490.
24. Good Will to Men. T. A. Manning. p. 495.
Brotherly Love and Patriotism. Monsignor H. T. Henry. p. 498.
A Pacifist Heresy. J. Keating. p. 505.

ENCYCLICALS FOR STUDY CLUBS

Arranged with questions (indicating pages where answers may be found) and many references to books and articles.

This makes these editions of the Encyclicals of definite value to study clubs and to classes.

•

The Christian Constitution of States (*Immortale Dei*)

•

On the Condition of the Laboring Classes (*Rerum Novarum*)

•

On Christian Marriage (*Casti Connubii*)

•

5 (by mail 7) cents each
\$4.00 per 100—\$30.00 per 1,000,
postage extra

Complete set (postpaid)15c

•

THE AMERICA PRESS, 461 EIGHTH AVE., NEW YORK, N. Y.

=====UP

=====UP

=====UP

It is a distinct pleasure to note the remarkable subscription progress of AMERICA, the National Catholic Weekly, in the last few months.

Yearly subscriptions are the highest since March, 1934.

School subscriptions are the highest since December, 1931.

Newsdealer sales are the highest since May, 1932.

Total weekly run is the highest since November, 1933.

This is encouraging and the Editors are grateful to the subscribers for their generous cooperation.

But there are many Catholics who have not subscribed yet, and so, with the wonted assistance of our friends, we hope to continue to go

\$4.00 Domestic

\$4.50 Canada

\$5.00 Foreign

UP=====

UP=====

UP=====

ble
nal

ce

De-

ay,

em-

eful
on.

ub-
of

=====
=====
=====
=====
=====

THE